

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed March 28, 2008 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 28-61 have been rejected. The Applicants have amended Claims 28, 39, 50 and 51 and have cancelled Claim 49. The Applicants reserve the right to further pursue the cancelled claims in a continuation and/or divisional application as well as for appeal purposes. In addition, the Applicants have added new Claim 62. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 28-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,734,373 to Rosenberg et al. (hereinafter “Rosenberg”). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Amended Claim 28 recites, *inter alia*, a sphere positioned in the housing, the sphere being rotatable in at least one rotary degree of freedom without requiring movement of the housing, wherein the sphere rotates in response to a user’s digit directly contacting and manipulating the sphere; and an actuator coupled to the housing and configured to output haptic feedback to the sphere, the haptic feedback being based on the sensor signals. It has not been shown in the Office Action that Rosenberg discloses, either expressly or inherently, the above elements/limitations in Claim 28. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Considering that Claim 28 is distinguishable over the cited art, Claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 39 recites, *inter alia*, a sphere positioned in the housing, the sphere being rotatable in at least one rotary degree of freedom without requiring movement of the housing, wherein the sphere rotates in response to a user's digit directly contacting and manipulating the sphere; an actuator coupled to the housing, the actuator being configured to output haptic feedback to the sphere; and at least one compliant element coupled to the housing and the actuator, the at least one compliant element being configured to amplify the haptic feedback. It has not been shown in the Office Action that Rosenberg discloses, either expressly or inherently, the above elements/limitations in Claim 39. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Considering that Claim 39 is distinguishable over the cited art, Claim 39 is in condition for allowance.

Amended Claim 51 recites, *inter alia*, a sensor configured to output sensor signals associated with a movement of the sphere in the rotary degree of freedom by directly contacting the sphere via a user's digit, wherein rotation of the sphere occurs without movement of the housing; and an actuator configured to output haptic feedback to the sphere, the haptic feedback being based on the sensor signals. It has not been shown in the Office Action that Rosenberg discloses, either expressly or inherently, the above elements/limitations in Claim 51. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of anticipation has not been established, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Considering that Claim 51 is distinguishable over the cited art, Claim 51 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 29-38, 40-48, 50, and 52-61 are respectively dependent on Independent Claim 29, 39, 51 and 62, of which these independent claims are allowable. Accordingly, Claims 29-38, 40-48, 50, and 52-61 are allowable for being dependent on allowable base claims.

New Claim

The Applicants have added new Claim 62 to the present application. The Applicants submit that New claim 62 is fully supported by the specification and no new matter has been added. Allowance of new Claim 62 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 29, 2008

/Suvashis Bhattacharya/  
Suvashis Bhattacharya  
Reg. No. 46,554

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP  
P.O. Box 640640  
San Jose, CA 95164-0640  
Tel. (408) 292-5800  
Fax (408) 287-8040